

"The people should be told the truth. After being made to believe for 14 years that black is white and two and two makes five, this novel approach to public questions might be good politics as well as good ethics. A campaign of education should emphasize the truism that no government on earth can create wealth or is gifted with black art which will produce wealth without work or creative industry; the people should be told that for the first time since Alexander Hamilton the credit of the Federal Government has been impaired by vast New Deal expenditures before the war and by incomprehensible sums expended in prosecuting the greatest war of all time; they should be told that economy is not optional, it is imperative; and that ambitious programs of public works and social legislation must await a clearing of the financial skies; labor should be told that wages come out of profits and the only way to maintain the high standard of American living is by creating wealth by capital and labor working in unison.

"Everyone should be told the blunt and unpleasant truth that we cannot juggle ourselves out of the mess we are in through political hocus-pocus or demagogic promises or legerdemain. We have all got to get down to work and produce something beside monkey wrenches to throw into the political machinery.

"The road ahead is long and hard, but it is not a hopeless task with which we are confronted. May the Republicans, now in the driver's seat in Congress, with a reasonable assurance of being in power in the executive branch of government 2 years hence, lead us with wisdom and courage through the troubled postwar waters which lie ahead. We must not fail. This blessed land, this lighthouse of liberty to millions of enslaved human beings throughout the world, must and shall be preserved."

Why Government Labor Courts Must Fail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1947

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement made by R. C. Holles, of Santa Ana, Calif., and published in the Bucyrus (Ohio) Telegraph-Forum on January 11, 1947, entitled "Why Government Labor Courts Must Fail." This is a lucid explanation and goes right to the heart of the matter. It follows:

WHY GOVERNMENT LABOR COURTS MUST FAIL (By R. C. Holles)

Many people think that the labor problem can be solved by government labor courts. If the word "compulsory" were used in discussing these labor courts, most people would not believe in them. But government labor courts would either have to have authority to enforce their decisions, and thus be compulsory, or else be only advisory. In either case, that is not the solution.

If a labor court is to be simply advisory it invariably will side with the party that has the most votes in order to keep its job as adviser. The consumer is the best voluntary counsel for labor disputes.

But let's consider what it would be if it were compulsory. Because we have courts to

settle disagreement, many people think we can have courts to settle labor disputes. But the case is not at all parallel. At present courts attempt only to interpret agreements that have already been made. They never attempt to tell two people they must make an agreement.

Let us suppose that an individual has a written agreement with his automobile dealer. He deems that the dealer has transgressed the agreement and takes it to court. The court interprets the agreement and tells what each party must do to comply with the agreement.

But the judge does not and would not attempt to say, in the absence of any prior commitment, what the automobile dealer should do in the absence of any agreement. The judge would not say that the individual must continue to patronize the automobile dealer or that the dealer must continue to do business with the individual, if there had been no agreement.

But compulsory arbitration on labor matters would do exactly that. It would attempt to force two parties to continue a relationship which they might not want to continue. If there is a labor dispute the labor court would come in. It hands down its decision, and the workers, although dissatisfied, must keep on working. They very likely would not keep on working, but we will assume they did. They probably would come to work but lay down on the job, so that the employer would not even want them there.

But suppose that the employees do continue their services under a decision unsatisfactory to them. After a year the arbitrators would call again. This time suppose the award is more satisfactory to the workers but the employer says he cannot abide it and still continue in business. Would he be privileged to close down his shop? Or would the workers have a right to say that since they were forced to accept a distasteful situation a year before, it is poor justice that does not also compel the employer to accept a decision unsatisfactory to him?

Hardly any contract is completely satisfactory to both sides. Both would like to have a better contract but it is the best they both can get. So instead of either one quitting or striking, both of them agree. Then we have no strikes. Then we have continued production. Then everybody, including the customers, workers, and employers, benefits more than if there were no agreement, even if not completely satisfactory to each side.

The Government has no magical way of making agreements satisfactory to both sides. The Government is only force. Compulsion or force is always distasteful or obnoxious to those on whom it is used.

The only way strikes can be avoided is by agreement. The only way we can have voluntary agreements, and all real agreements are voluntary, is to have each party realize that he never can get all he wants and that all he is entitled to is the right to make a bargain with anyone in the world who will give him the best bargain. That is all either the employer or worker is entitled to. Anything else takes away from some person his God-given right to exchange his services with the person who will give him the most.

If the Government interferes with free exchanges it is not an impartial government; it is a government of men rather than a government of law. Unless we can get people to believe that no man, no matter how poor, and no firm, no matter how rich, has a right to have protection from competition, we will continue to have labor troubles. Our production will be restricted, friction will grow, and our standard of living will be less than it would be, and unless we are careful, we will wind up with a dictator who will tell us all how we shall trade.

Resolution of Nonbasic Steel Coordinating Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HOWARD A. COFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 14, 1947

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

To the Congress of the United States:

At a meeting of the board of governors of the Nonbasic Steel Coordinating Committee held November 14, 1946, in Washington, D. C., it was unanimously resolved that the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to investigate by an appropriate committee the adequacy and results of existing labor laws and regulations, to determine among other basic requisites of sound labor relations the following:

A. If the said laws and regulations do give protection to the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively.

B. If the equality of bargaining power has been restored between employers and employees.

C. If fundamental practices have been encouraged to the friendly adjustment of industrial disputes arising out of differences as to wages, hours, or other working conditions.

D. If business has been safeguarded from injury, impairment or interruption.

Respectfully submitted.

NONBASIC STEEL COORDINATING
COMMITTEE,

By E. S. EVANS, Jr.,

Chairman, Board of Governors.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 4, 1947.

Year of Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 13, 1947

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, during the annual convention of the Speech Association of America, which was held this year in the Sherman Hotel, of Chicago, Dr. W. Norwood Brigrance, chairman of the speech department of Wabash College and president of the Speech Association of America, delivered one of the most stimulating and thought-provoking addresses it has been my pleasure to hear in many years.

It is a challenge to Congress as well as to American citizens generally as this Republic surveys its educational problems which include not only the need for the more adequate financing of schools and more respectable salaries for teachers but which also emphatically include the need for a careful scrutiny and reevaluation of the curricula of our schools and colleges to determine how much of the course of study is adapted and adaptable to the world of today and how much simply remains in the curriculum because of tradition, inertia, or indifference.